DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 574 PS 007 077

AUTHOR Katz, Lilian G.
TITLE Early Childhood Re-Visited.
INSTITUTION Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE 16 Jun 72
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Administrators' Conference (Atlanta, Georgia, June 16, 1972)
AVAILABLE FROM The Alabama, Florida, Georgia Early Childhood Teacher Training Project Suite 490, Barnett Bank Building, Tallahassee, Fl 32302 (Free of charge)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS Child Rearing; Disadvantaged Youth; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Objectives; Open Education; Parent Child Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This booklet presents a discussion of some moral and philosophical aspects of issues in early childhood education, beginning with a look at the development of Project Head Start. Current educational research is interpreted and distinctions are made between academic and intellectual goals, between achieving and learning, between performing and teaching, and between excitement and sustained interest. Some principles are suggested for teachers to remember: (1) goals and objectives really count, (2) attend to how children feel, (3) problems in education are also problems in society, (4) support a leader selected because he is competent, (5) identify your own assignment and do it well, (6) when meeting with colleagues and leaders, identify the problem to be solved (not the personalities), (7) remember the distinction between selling an idea and teaching, and (8) don't expect quick results. Finally, it's more important to inspire a mother's confidence in her child than to do what is pedagogically proper. (SET)

ED 088574

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

a tri-state feature report

PS 002027

EARLY CHILDHOOD REVISITED

KATZ

EARLY CHILDHOOD RE-VISITED

DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION
Tallahassee, Florida

FLOYD T. CHRISTIAN
COMMISSIONER

This public document was promulgated at an annual cost of $287.24 or $.29 per copy to disseminate project materials.

EARLY CHILDHOOD RE-VISITED

DR. LILLIAN KATZ

An associate professor of early childhood education and director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

This presentation was given at the Administrators' Conference in Atlanta on June 16, 1972. This Conference was sponsored by the Alabama, Florida, Georgia Early Childhood Teacher Training Project.

Permission to reprint this presentation was kindly granted by Dr. Katz.

EARLY CHILDHOOD RE-VISITED

I have been asked to address myself to a whole range of topics this morning. I would like to spend a little time on a very brief recent history of Early Childhood, its research and development in the last 8 or 10 years. Then I would like to share with you my own interpretation of where we are now, on current findings and then leave you with a set of propositions or principles about the field as I see it.

My remarks are based very largely on my own personal analysis of what I have seen in Early Childhood development, all around the country, and in other countries too, what I have studied and what I have thought and, I must say, very especially what I feel. In this way it is a personal interpretation of developments.

I think most of you are familiar with the beginnings of the early childhood boom. When you look back at the original ideas that the designers of these programs had, they seem now very naive and over simplified. But it's kind of interesting—if some of you who have been involved in Early Childhood since and before 1965 would take out some old papers you have that came out at that time, you might be surprised to see how oversimplified they now look. In the original days of this development, the designers rested their case primarily on the notion that the pre-school years are the most formative ones in a child's development. This was the heart of the proposition. They also said that those years, the pre-school years, should be full of stimulation, which they came to call enrichment. Some of you may remember that when we first started to talk about Head Start, for instance, we called it summer enrichment program.

They also said that the children of families who are poor don't have enough stimulation; they don't have enough

enrichment, and furthermore, that lack of stimulation and enrichment would cause children to be unresponsive to school. Finally one summer of enrichment would give the poor child what we called then a head start to later schooling. All of this was simple, was persuasive, was reasonable, it was logical and above all it was humane. Now, 7 or more years later, how does it all sound? First, the most obvious error in the original design, certainly in the original thinking, was that poor children are understimulated. This is very rarely the case.

It is frequently true that children who are poor are growing in a very rich environment; they are rich socially, culturally and linguistically. They are as rich in meaning and in complexity as are the experiences of well-off children. They suffer very commonly from overstimulation. The key is that they suffer from insufficient adult help in making sense out of these environments. One can say that for many children who are poor (and this is also true for many children who are not poor) that they often starve in the midst of plenty. When you can't understand the things that are going on around you, you come to feel stupid. Sometimes it is hard for adults to believe, but just try to picture suddenly finding yourself in a country where you don't understand the language. You can't make sense out of what's happening around you. The customs are just extremely different. You do feel very clumsy and you feel stupid. So the child who is living in a complicated environment about which he understands very little comes to feel stupid, and if you have a lot of experience feeling stupid, you become stupid. We then accuse the children of being stupid. So my basic point here is that children are not understimulated in poor communities or in families which are poor. They suffer from the lack of adults who help them to understand and to make sense out of their experiences. They need adults who will explain and clarify, and label those things for them early in life.

Secondly, there is no poor child as such, which we didn't know then; there is no great big category of kids called "poor." There are just as many individual differences among children who are from poor families of every ethnic group as there are from children from well-off families. Among both the rich and the poor, some children's development is going well; some not. Among both rich and poor some children have low self-esteem; some high. Some feel unloved; some not, and remember there are many children who are growing in wealthy families who feel unloved. It is not a special problem of the poor. Note also, that parents who are poor are also as different from each other as parents who are rich. Just because parents are Chicanos or they are poor, does not mean that they all agree with each other, that they are all alike. Some have preferences for one kind of education over another. Not all people who are poor understand the poor, either. So we know now that there are very few generalizations about children or families who are poor. And that there are a few exceptions which I will briefly list.

It is now very clear and not much disputed that with poverty, with increasing poverty wherever you are, whether you are in the U.S. or in India, or in South America, the hazards to your health increase, and there are some very important cross-national studies to look at here that have to do with the mother both being too young or too old; those of you who are not yet 18 or over 35 who are still making plans, you might consider that: The optimum age for child bearing is between those two. But now, of course, we are getting a great deal of information about the impact of nutrition. The nutritional factor in the development of intelligence and, so forth, has its greatest impact in the first 6 months of life, and its impact may be irreversible.

The second generalization that seems to hold, although it needs some clarification, is that with increasing poverty wherever you are, in America or elsewhere, the sense of personal powerlessness over important events also increases. I am not sure that other countries have been confronted with this sense of powerlessness quite as much as we have, but we've still got a lot to do here and finally I have to admit there is a very consistent finding in the research that has been done in the last ten years or so that in every country where children are poor their language development is slow, and that seems to hold everywhere. There is still some dispute about that. It has something to do with the size of the family and the amount of adult input and so on, but again, the research on the whole seems to maintain a fairly consistent picture along those lines.

Now I want to point out one thing that has changed since the early days of Early Childhood planning in the early 60's that no one thought about then but is now true. The original plan, if you remember, for Head Start and other Early Childhood projects was to prepare children for school, school as we knew it. But there now is, which was not true then, enormous wide spread dissatisfaction with our public schools. There are very few people who are willing to defend them. That wasn't true in the 60's.

There were a lot of us who were dissatisfied with our public schools, but it now has taken on national proportions. Even candidates for public office talk about them. One of the games people play is how to de-school society and what is wrong with it. But it wasn't true in the early 60's. It seemed at that time defensible to try to prepare children for school. Now, we also know what we didn't know then, that the summer of enrichment is not enough. My own personal view here, and I say this just between us, is that we have over sold Early Childhood

Education. It cannot in one summer, or one year, or even in two years overcome the lifelong effects of poverty. I frankly was appalled by what Dr. McAndrew said yesterday about his willingness to dump high school children into the street and put his money into the Early Childhood Program. You will remember there was applause and that struck me very uncomfortable. What I think we have to see is that early childhood education is extremely important. Working with infants, now going on, is extremely important but it is not more important than all later education. All education is important and the community must come to care deeply about all of its children all the way through their development, which goes on for at least 18 years. What people forget so often is our teenagers who are very big, and bigger than we are, are still immature and what they need so desperately is adults who are wise.

So basically I want to say that we oversold the power of Early Childhood development program to modify the effects of poverty all through the child's life—you cannot do that. But we must look at it in the total years of development, all of them. I would certainly never want to see, even though I am very much a pre-school person, that we did something at pre-school level at the sacrifice of later years, because they are all important years.

ED 070 251

Next, we have now a large enough body of research, although it is very difficult to do good research on young children, to look at something of the consistencies in the findings. My students and I have collected some 20 studies in which different curriculum models have been compared to each other, and I'm sure you've heard about these. We are trying to find the consistencies in this research. I want to memtion, I won't go through the study, but I will mention the consistencies we have found—at least so far. First of all, the majority of studies in which various models can be compared, children who

have been in academic programs do better on standard measures than children who have been in a more open program. But t is also true, that by 2nd grade the effects will wash out. Another finding, which is not nearly as well developed as it should be, is that all models are difficult to implement in one way or another, even those apparently simple models like the behavior analysis model, or the behavior modification model, which look very simple on the surface, are difficult to implement for different reasons.

Another interesting finding, which is quite consistent across t'e research, is that you get what you teach, and its called specificity of effects. That is if a model emphasizes teaching the names of colors or reading or whatever, that's what the kids turn out to be good at, so you really get a strong picture of success in what it is you emphasize.

Now I'd like to shift from this very quick history to the second part of my discussion today and that is my interpretation of this current research and what it means and I'd like to do this partly by enumerating the set of distinctions that I think ought to be made.

First, as I have already indicated there is a consistent finding in the research that you get what you teach, that is to say the ball is really in the teacher's court. If you want your child to learn to read or to write or to count, it can be done. That's what you have to teach. It is not efficient and it doesn't last but it certainly is possible. The question of whether you want to do that or not actually is not a research question. There is no way that these comparative studies can really answer the question for you, should I teach X rather than Y. The ultimate decision must be made on moral and philosophical grounds, and research cannot do that. Only individuals can search their own moral convictions to

make that decision. Interestingly to me, we now know how to do these things: make children (and I use the term "make" children) learn to read early. I have been watching children at the age of 4 learning in their 376 steps to reading, learn how to read, all be it rather silly words. You can also teach these children to write. There are 29 steps to that. We know how to do it. It is inefficient, but it can be done. You can get this at the age of 4 and certainly you can maintain this. You cannot be perfect, but you can maintain it. But here I would like to make a distinction, which I personally find helpful, between programs which have academic goals and programs which have intellectual goals. Programs with academic goals are those which emphasize helping the child to acquire the role of pupil, accepting routines and conforming to the daily routine of the classroom, learning how to raise your hand—I've actually seen this. I'm sure it doesn't happen in these 3 states, but it does happen in other states, but where people have spent a good deal of their energy teaching a child when to raise his hand. They also include in some of these programs what I call "legislated bladders," too for young children.

These programs also emphasize motivation to achieve. Now, some of these are quite good and I should say that one of the best examples, if you want to look at good examples, is that at Peabody, called Darcee. Some of you have seen it. I have never seen it myself, but my general feeling is that it is one well done or well thought through. Now let's look a little better at what we mean by intellectual goals. Here we are talking about programs which emphasize helping the child to strengthen his role as a learner rather than as a pupil. Where you encourage a child to become an inquirer, to become an explorer, to become an investigator, in fact, rather when to raise your hand. Here the emphasis is on the motivation to achieve. And I sometimes wonder about my students, my graduate students, who have not learned or acquired

motivation to study because something is interesting. It is very hard for them. They have motivation to achieve and I now have a steady flow of students coming in from last semester wanting to know why they only got B's and so forth. That's motivation to **achieve**, not motivation to **learn**. Often these goals, and intellectual goals, are in contradiction with each other.

I want to suggest, that in fact, we have stated the goals of education inappropriately. We have usually said that the goal of education is to help children to acquire academic skills, namely the 3 R's and I suggest that the research indicates that we now know how to do this. But it seems to me, a more appropriate way to state the goal of education is to find a way to help children and this may include adults, also, to acquire the skills they need, including academic skills, if you will, to acquire the knowledge that they need and the personal resources they need in such a way that you also at the same time strengthen, safeguard, protect, and, in fact, enhance their sense of self-worth, their sense of dignity, self-respect, that you enhance their curiosity, their compassion and their tenderness.

It is really a problem of mutually inclusive goals that I think we face here. We know how to get the academic achievements, but what we don't know very well is how to get these academic goals, intellectual goals, and these humane goals mutually inclusive. So, I have already indicated that we know how to get academic programs going; we know how to get them maintained, but I personally, and this is a personal and moral decision, find the academic goals to be cheap goals, unworthy of our national heritage and unworthy of our children. So many of us who are interested in this problem of how to fashion an education which could achieve the mutually inclusive goals of acquiring skills and knowledge and personal resources are turning to what are now called

get enough of them, you can make something which will balance a 4 year-old child and you can make your own calibrations, and here she got the child involved in the whole principle of the spring scale. Now that again is taking off from the child's own environment and experiences and own interest, and moving him along in a very meaningful way. Well, I know many examples like that and I'm sure many of you are doing these things, but it does lead me into another, not quite related distinction that I want to draw to your attention.

I would like, if I may, to make a distinction between teaching and performing. This is a hard one to spell out, but I have been very concerned from time to time working with teachers because they always seem to me to be doing something in order to please a third person who isn't there. Sometimes what they're doing, they say to me now (I'm sure this never happens in the Tri-State Area), I wouldn't do this myself but my children are going on to Mrs. Jones' first grade and I know that she insists that all her children must know how to do such and such, so I have to do it. That's teaching to please the next teacher. Then sometimes, they are teaching to please the parent, and often without knowing the parent. Now you can't please all parents and often it is only one anyway who comes in to complain and that doesn't represent the silent majority at all. Teachers are often doing things to please a parent, and she will say I don't really like the idea of doing this, but you know how the parents are, and without any confirmation of whether this is the case. The teachers are also often teaching to please the administrator. Again, without always knowing if this is really what the administrator expects. The administrators tell me that they don't like what teachers are doing, and at the same time the teachers say the same thing about administrators. Sometimes teachers are caught trying to please an assistant or an aide in a classroom. This can be very trying. Here is an example of

informal methods, but popularly known as open education. This leads me to the second distinction I want to make between classes which are **open** and those which are really **empty**. Rather, I think, the term informal is more appropriate. To me a class which is informal sometimes called open, but certainly not empty, is one which helps children to make sense out of their own experiences, out of their own environment, out of their own feelings. As children get older, you can help them make sense out of other peoples' experiences and so a 10 year-old can understand, be helped to understand experiences he himself has never had. Those of us who are interested in young children are concerned with helping children to make sense out of their own experiences first.

This is a classroom in which children can acquire the knowledge and skills they need as tools with which to examine, to analyze, to record, observe, measure, explore, grasp, describe and organize their own environment and their own experiences, as I have said and eventually the experiences and environments of others. Let me give you an example which some of you may have seen and it has been mentioned in the publication of informal education that Edith Biggs, the Math inspector from England, told. It is an example of helping children work with their own experiences. This was a class, this was in England, 6 year-olds in which the teacher said to the children—which one of you sleeps the longest? One of the little boys in the class said, "Well the one who goes to bed first," and the teacher in the class said, "Well, I don't think that's quite right; how about tomorrow you bring a little piece of paper saying what time you went to bed and what time you got up," and so some of the children could write themselves; some of them had to have it written. But they brought their raw data into class the next day and the teacher had to make a horizontal bargraph. But, each child had a

a teacher, a Head Start teacher, a young woman who is white, who was very committed to her children, but her assistant in the classroom was black, and it was interesting. A 4 year-old boy in the classroom was very disruptive and the teacher was afraid to limit the child, because she did not want the black aide to think that she was picking on the black boy. Now, the black aide thought this child ought to be handled, too. But, they had not communicated across this and so with the absence of any clarification this became a very difficult situation, and the child paid the price.

Another way that teachers are caught teaching for a third person is teaching for the evaluation or the tester. Now this is subtle and it does happen certainly in some parts of the country, whether you know it or not, where you introduce something into your curriculum to please this third group that isn't even there, often without knowing the valid fact as to what they are expecting. On the whole, I would like to refer to this whole syndrome as Education for After Life, i.e., teaching the child so that when he goes to the next grade he will be able to so and so. When he goes to Jr. High he'll have this, and when he goes to high school he'll have that, and he'll have his fundamentals when he goes to college, so that he'll go to the right graduate school and on you go until you see groups of people wasting away in old age homes. There's got to be something wrong with it all. To me teaching to a third person who isn't there isn't teaching; it's performing as in front of an audience and in this case an imaginary audience that you don't even know very well. It's very exhausting. Real teaching comes with direct inter-action with the individual and yourself in which you can see yourselves as, in fact, the only two people who exist at this moment. There is nobody behind your back. That seems rather idealistic and it's something I'd like to discuss in more detail if we get time. Now, we'll move on and say in very summary

line, a horizontal line. The teacher had marked on the top 24-hour periods and each child filled in with his own name a color bar which represented the time he went to sleep and the time he woke up, so that you can see from the picture display, quite visibly that relative independence of what time you go to bed and how long you sleep. But that was only the beginning of making sense out of their own experiences. The teacher then had the children do all kinds of things to this raw data. For example, one group of children summarized the data in terms such as: 10 of us slept for 11 hours; 9 of us slept for 8 hours, and they grouped the data. We called it descriptive statistics when we're adults. They grouped the data; they rank-ordered it so that it started with the longest period down to the shortest period. They they rank-ordered it in terms of the largest number of children down to the smallest number of children.

Then they did things like—how many children were asleep between 9:00 and midnight? How many children were asleep between 8:00 and midnight? These are overlapping intervals, but they don't use that term. These were relatively sophisticated mathematical operations on the children's own raw data.

She also told me another little story about a 4 year-old who liked to come to her house because he liked to weigh himself on the bathroom scale, and she got intrigued one day whether the child really knew what it meant. She had a European scale which registered in kilograms. One day she said to the little boy, "Now, what do you suppose that says on the dial;" and the child said, "Well, you know." She said "How does it work?" and the child said, "There are 17 little kilos in there. When I step on it—they jump up." Now, this is a pretty good 4 year-old understanding, but she decided to work with this. What she did was make a scale out of the springs that come in ladies' hair curlers and if you

form, that to me, a teacher is someone who alerts children to the things in his environment which are:

Worth knowing. Teachers must make this decision about what's worth knowing or adults, or administrators, or school board. You cannot abdicate that decision.

There is no way that a research program can tell you what's worth knowing. I mean you might ask, and I've done this with my students and found it very instructive. Does a child have to know when Washington's birthday is? Is is worth knowing and why? Those turn out to be very interesting questions. The adults cannot let that decision be made by children alone; they are too young and they are too immature.

Also a teacher has to alert the child to things that are potentially interesting; now we know a lot of things that young children are potentially interested in: things that move, like trucks, planes: most children are potentially interested in animals and it is up to us as adults, mothers, and teachers to alert them to those things. Finally, teachers must alert children to things which are important whether they are interesting or not. Again, it is a matter of adults making a decision about what they consider important for children to know. They should know a teacher is someone who helps children to interpret the events, to interpret the feelings that they are having and others around them. A teacher helps children to evaluate what they are doing and so on. This is a long list and I think I'd better leave that because it is going to take up too much time. Besides which I think, these are all things you know.

One of the things that worries me here is that many of the models available in Early Childhood Education emphasize performing rather than teaching.

Now, another distinction I want to make, and I'm switching here a little bit, is a distinction I find helpful between children having fun and children getting satisfaction. So many teachers will tell me (and models also) that children are having lots of fun in their program. I consider this a **cheap** goal. We must offer children a chance to gain the kind of satisfaction that comes from problem-solving, problem-posing, hard work, hard effort and mastering and I'm not talking about the order. It is unfair to children when we fail to encourage them to tackle things that are difficult and even occasionally tedious. It does not mean that you don't make demands on them. That is the crucial distinction.

I want to suggest, and this is a personal view, that children need adults, they need to feel loved by adults who are strong. Being loved by someone who is weak is nice, but it doesn't help you to grow. You need the love of someone you can look up to, someone who is self respecting and someone who is strong; that is essential to growth, at least in my interpretation of the data.

People have a fairly steady level. People vary quite a bit in how energetic they are; each individual has his own sort of normal level which we can picture in a fairly straight line. Now when we introduce an experience which is exciting, that level of responsiveness goes up, but by definition, it cannot stay up because you cannot stay excited by definition, by the nature of neurophysiology of the organism; you have to come down. My hypothesis here is that you don't just come down back to where you started. What happens is that you come down below that. And it's a period of withdrawal for some, of behavior disorganization certainly for children but among adults it is a period of depression, and what you may find yourself doing to bring the person out of it is introducing a second exciting experience. Only this

time you are doubling the dose. So, when it comes to educational innovation, for instance, somebody goes out and says to the teachers, administrators, I've got this great idea; I've got this thing that is going to save you all. People get excited about this innovation. The level of excitement goes up, of course; they've oversold the thing and your excitement is bound to wear off, but you don't just come down to your ordinary level of activity. You come down below it and here is a period of depression, distrust and a feeling of cynicism. "I'm never going to trust another innovation or curriculum developer in my life." Then in order to get people to move again you have to double this dose and you have to make bigger promises. That is what is happening in educational innovation and I get this picture very strongly in the clearinghouse where we are constantly being told by the people we report to go ahead and sell an idea; make it exciting. Now let's get back to the young child again.

What we do with young children is we introduce some sort of a cheap gimmick, and this is what I'm really trying to get at, that turns on kids. Of course, it wears off because you can't be turned on all the time and when it wears off the teachers feel sort of rejected because they do lean a great deal on the reinforcement that children give them. So, they introduce an even more cheap gimmick and everybody is locked in a spiral. It is sort of a thrill-oriented kindergarten class. It is not an independent problem; it is a problem of the whole culture. Yesterday Dr. McAndrew used the word exciting four times, which is low. I've done these frequency counts. Listen to the television, that's where you hear it most. Everything is exciting. What happens here when the enthusiasm grows and the fad increases; the faddism of our profession is very frightening, as I've tried to indicate, you don't come back to your baseline, but you begin to need a bigger dose in order to get turned on again. Now, there are several reasons why this is im-

portant, and I realize that I haven't made this very clear but it is a very hard concept to deal with, especially without an illustration. It's because the real work of this world is not exciting. Let me see if I can make this clear. If you look at the television, they try to depict on the television the lives of doctors, detectives, and lawyers as going from one peak experience to another, nothing but thrills. But if you think about it, you will realize that the health of the community is maintained by the man who gives booster shots and who looks at sore throats, a hundred a week, and that could not be exciting. When the physician looks at a sore throat, he must always do this alertly in order not to miss significant symptoms; now, being able to perform routine procedures alertly is the mark of the professional and this is not exciting. It just cannot be. They always picture a lawyer as having great dramatic experiences in the courtroom and I'll bet you that 90% of a lawyer's life is day to day routine. He, also, must do it alertly in order not to miss loopholes and make mistakes that are important. Now teaching is like that, too. If anyone has told a prospective teacher that it is going to be exciting, he has very much misled the teacher; satisying yes, but exciting no. And that's the distinction I want to make. That's because we introduce children to these cheap, exciting experiences. They are unable to learn or they cannot learn the satisfaction that comes from extended activity. When I go into a Head Start program, a nursery program, or a kindergarten program, what I look for as my method of evaluation is—is there a sign that these children have been involved in an ongoing activity that lasts for a few weeks, something they are constructing or building or extending. What I typically see are these collage things with macaroni stuck on paper. There is a place for that, but most of them I see is a one shot, one time activity that is scheduled between 10:15 and 10:40. Now here is where you've got to find everyday a new bag of tricks to excite children and turn them on. You

rob the children in this way of learning how to get satisfaction that comes with an extended project of getting involved in it and of even dealing with some routine. So, as I've indicated that's a hard one to deal with. I've tried several times to write this, but it's very hard to write, too. but i think I have finally taught my staff at the clearing house not to use the word excitement, because they come to me once in a while and say; here's an idea and this is really exciting, and I finally gave them my 10 minute lecture on the evils of excitement, really dealing with cheap goals and even a cheap activity when you go into this excitement. Occasionally it is very nice, but you can't involve your whole life around thrill-seeking. I want to summarize this speech by saying that we seem to settle for cheap thrills, for quick success which I consider hollow success. We give our children one shot, one time activity, and as I've indicated, I always look in the classroom for evidence of what children, are constructing, building, and making which encourages their sustained interest and involvement, which encourages them to plan and to execute plans, to engage in problem solving at a developmentally appropriate level.

Now I'm in my final swing here, so don't be discourages. I would like to summarize what I've tried to say here in a set of propositions or principles, and I believe I have 10 or 11 here and we're going to go through them as fast as I can. First of all if it is true that you get what you teach, your goals and your objectives as teachers and administrators really do count. Two, if you want to help children acquire skills and knowledge and personal strength in such a way as to increase their sense of self-respect, their capacity for insight, compassion and tenderness, then you really must attend very specificially to how children **feel.** It is fundamentally the quality of feeling that life is all about. And this is an amazing

problem with the behavioral objective movement. The Behavioral Objectives are fine if they have their place, but only if you take into account how people feel about what they are doing. Third, I am convinced that there are no problems in education which are not also problems in the rest of our society, including the problem of excitement. In the rest of our society there is waste, bickering, incompetence, provincialism, racism, and so forth. I sometimes think of another problem in education which is also similar in the rest of society and what I've come to call the "blamedrain." Everyone is blaming someone else. And in education this is fairly typical. I talk sometimes to principals who say well, I'd like to do so and so in my school, but I can never get my teachers to change their habits. So they blame the teachers. I had a feeling in some of what Dr. McAndrew was saying yesterday that he was counting on parents to save him. A lot of people feel that if you just involve parents you'll solve problems. That's very misleading because parents are people, too. They can help but there are no quick solutions. But sometimes people blame parents and teachers will say, "I could do so much for my kids but the parents won't help me."

Teachers love to blame administrators for all their problems, and the administrators, I'm sure have people to blame, school boards, regional offices, and so on. But all of this blaming is a waste of energy. A great deal of energy gets diverted into this kind of activity which could better be used in solving the problem. And this brings me to my fourth principle, namely, I want to alert your attention here to the fact that our leaders, and this is a national problem, are very badly treated. Remember, and those of you who get restless because you are administrators or because you are not, that when an administrator's work is done well, he makes it possible for the really important things to happen. And there is

really nothing as great as a good administrator to free you to do the important things which are the quality of lives the people in classrooms. But I think we treat leaders very badly. There is a great deal of backfighting and I'm sure this is not so bad in the South, but I do hear it other places. There is a lot of nitpicking and bitching about administrators and a lot of rumormongering. But it seems to me there are two ways in which leaders emerge. One is they emerge out of a resolution of a power struggle. Another way, which I don't see very often, but I hope happens, is they come to leadership positions because they are competent. That's an important distinction. If you come to a leadership position because you have emerged out of a power struggle you must spend a great deal of your energy preserving that power and maintaining it. And this becomes very difficult; this is where all this biting and fighting goes on, because you are sort of trying to hold on to power, perhaps not very legitimate power. If, however, you manage to get your leaders to their leadership roles because they are competent, then my recommendation to you is get behind them. While I was writing this last night, I put down here "when your leader has been selected because he is competent, get behind him," and I changed it to say, "when your leader is selected because she is competent, get behind her." We readily complain when leaders fall down, but we rarely compliment them when they are carrying on a tough struggle. I think as general property of the nation we treat leaders very badly. I hope we can change that. Incidentally, in terms of complaints, I don't know if you are familiar with this, but during the period in which the day care bill was being considered, the Office of Child Development was receiving on the average 800 letters a day against the day care legislation—hate-mail. It was full of the stuff saying day care is a communist plot and all that sort of thing. But they were not getting any of the other letters, and that's fairly typical. Another thing I

want to say here on the problems of administrators, is that I have a strong hunch that if you are an administrator, and you want to know how you are behaving, watch the way the teachers treat the children, because I think there is a good deal of similarity. I have been very impressed by a principal of a school who had one of the most encouraging Head Start programs I have ever seen. The teachers were great. They were very demanding of the children, but they were very warm and encouraging at the same time. And I made up my mind I was going to figure out how this happened. I went back several times to this program to try to figure out why it was a good program. Usually I'm spending my time trying to figure out what is wrong with a program. This one was really good. Then I began to see that when the teachers were being supportive, encouraging and demanding of the children, this was exactly how the principal was behaving with her staff. She was supportive, encouraging, but she was demanding, and that's where I began to think there's something to that. Perhaps the way the administrators treat the people of their staffs is reflecting the way their staff in turn treat other people. I don't know if that's true; it's just a strong hunch I have. You might think about that if you want to. My fifth principle here is that I would encourage each of you to identify, and as accurately as you can, what is your own assignment, being careful that you don't end up minding everyone else's business; now this I've seen in places. But do your job extremely well. You might think of looking at your own job as an art form.

Stand back from it occasionally looking and checking to see how it is going and try again. Sixth principle here. When you meet with your leaders and colleagues, try and ask the question: What is the problem to be solved? Not who is right, who is going to win, who is going to come out as some people say, smelling like roses. Be careful, in the similar way, of the question of grassroots, another

myth that has grown up around education. We have to be very careful about this. Sometimes what we are identifying as grassroots, and this is certainly true when we talk about students in the university as grassroots, turns out to be the loudest voice. Remember that people who are the grassroots do not agree with each other just because they are grassroots. Just because people are poor does not automatically qualify them to be experts. It doesn't also qualify them not to be. I remember working in Head Start the first year in San Francisco and a mother came to me, a poor mother, and said now never mind anything else, when my child doesn't behave, beat him. I can understand why she felt that way; I couldn't do that, by the way, and if I had to take all my instructions from the grassroots, it would be very difficult. I saw a Head Start program in Indiana, very, very poor community, where a father has refused to take his child to a clinic. He had cut his hand on an electric fan and it was very, very badly infected, and the father insisted that this was the way the child was going to learn his lesson about touching electrical equipment. That's a grassroots' opinion.

I had been working in the Head Start program for two years and on one occasion there were 12 children in the program who had been infected with impetigo and this was a grassroots program and nobody recognized it. Now it's not a serious disease. It can be handled, but it also can be avoided by the way. So, let's temper our judgement about grassroots and accept the fact that the grassroots' participation is important, but it is not a simple solution. Getting back to the principle here, it is identifying the problem that is to be solved. Ask the question: What is it I can do without money, or without facilities or equipment? That's not a bad exercise, and besides that may come to be the case. Seven, I forgot to list in my set of distinctions, but I will mention here. Remember the distinction between selling an idea and

teaching. We have a very strong tendency to sell ideas and to sell programs and that's another whole semester's work that I'd like to go into when I can. But we tend to treat our clients as though they were customers. Now the problem with that is, when you are selling something to a customer you always have to develop a straw man and tell what's wrong with his vacuum cleaner and how bad it is and knock the other guy over, and you also, often always, have to oversell, but instead what we ought to be doing with our clients is informing them and explaining and alerting them to the problems of whatever it is that we are trying to suggest. When the IPI people went out with their great material, they went out promising a year's growth for a year's work without informing people that here are things we cannot do; here are the types of problems that come up. These are some of the weaknesses. We tend to use the salesmen model so often in education.

Now, this leads me to my eighth part and I'm coming to the end here. Let's please give up expecting quick results. Don't look for rewards or recognition. After all, we're all adults now. Look to your own internalized ethics and convictions if you need to strengthen your courage. But be patient, or perhaps a better word is wise. Please don't settle for quick, cheap success or for temporary excitement. Nine. A big problem, which is also a whole semester's work. A major problem we confront in all education, but certainly in early childhood is Whose goals are we supposed to meet? Are you supposed to be satisfying the goals of the advisory council, of your executive director, of USOE, State coordinators, whose goals? And are they all alike?

Remember, that human development is so complicated so whatever you might say that's true is also not true. And many statements that we make, from which we derive our goals, are very much over-simplified.

Let me give you an example here. Many of us, I'm sure many of you in this room, are interested in Open Education, sometimes called Child-Centered. That's a terribie word for it. But, suppose your parents don't want that. Some parents, and you must respect this, and treat this as valid, really want much more obvious signs that the children are learning than you are likely to see in an informal program. Here is a principle that I would very much like to suggest to you. My principle here is that it is more important to inspire a Mother's confidence in her child's future ability to cope with life than it is to do what is pedagogically proper. I know that's hard. But, let me give you an example.

I was talking with a Head Start teacher in a Chicano program in California. A mother came to the teacher and said, "I do not want my son to play with dolls or to dress up." Now the teacher thought that playing with dolls and dressing was pedagogically very significant. The position, I am taking here, is that it is more important to respect that mother's position because her confidence in her son will carry him a long way, but pedagogical practices at the age of four will not. I have been amazed at the confidence that parents have had in some of these academic models. But I would suggest to those of you whose personal goals and personal decisions are more comfortable with informal models, if your parents are pressuring you to do more academic things, assign part of the day to structured activities, but do it well. You can do structured activities well and badly, as in fact you can do informal things well and badly. Then do the rest of the day openly but well.

Now, finally, it seems to me that the most important struggle in our country today is the struggle for equality. And I'm amazed how often this gets overlooked and I worry a great deal about some of the women's lib groups

who forget that this is such a deep, deep problem in so many ways. The fact, it seems to me, is that we are not equally tall, we are not equally short, or agile, or beautiful, or good at math or cooking. We are not equally artistic, but **we are equally human.** We are equally human in the sense that we all want to be wanted, and loved, respected, and admired. We all have fears and doubts, anxieties, aspirations, ambitions. We all have, I suppose, some unresolved childish wishes. And you all know, you each know, that you have an inner life of concerns and desires. Just remember from time to time that everyone else does, too. Being human is perhaps best described by the way we feel about other people and the way we respond to them and the way we care for them. In this basic sense, in terms of how we feel about others and about ourselves we are all equally human. We have more in common than we have apart. In your concerted effort to help children in your states and communities, address yourselves to the basic humanness of each other, treating each other as equally human. Remember finally that every time you look at an educational issue, no matter how small it is, you end up needing a new society. I don't know how you do that and I know you cannot do that quickly. The fundamental issues in education cannot be solved by research. Research can help. It can clarify. It can raise the issue. It can increase your appreciation for the complexities and causes of behavior. But the basic and important decisions in education are moral and philisophical ones. In these domains there are no experts. It is up to all of us to make those kinds of decisions.

I have simply tried to share with you my moral and philisophical positions on some of these issues and I hope it helps.